IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mack Glenn, Jr.,)	C/A No.	3:11-430-JFA-SVH
)		
Plaintiff,)		
)		
V.)		ORDER
)		
Officer C. Wlashcin, in his individual an	id)		
official capacity,)		
)		
Defendant.)		
)		

The *pro se* plaintiff, Mack Glenn, Jr., brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claiming various constitutional violations by the defendant.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that the plaintiff has failed to set forth a constitutional violation entitling him to relief under § 1983. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation and without a hearing.

The defendant has filed a motion for summary judgment. An order was then issued pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) notifying plaintiff of the summary dismissal procedure and possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

to the motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff responded to the motion.

The plaintiff was then advised of his right to file objections to the Report and

Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on February 14, 2012. However, the

plaintiff did not file any objections to the Report within the time limits prescribed. In the

absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required

to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d

198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and

Recommendation, the court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation proper and

incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the defendant's motion for summary

judgment (ECF No. 25) is granted and this action is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 6, 2012

Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr. United States District Judge

Joseph F. anderson J.

2